

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application, and claims 1-20 stand rejected on various grounds, as stated in the Official Action mailed by the Office on 15 July 2005 (hereinafter, the "Action"). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections, based on the comments and revisions contained herein.

Rejections Based on § 102*Shepherd Reference*

As stated in Paragraph 2 of the Action, Claims 1-8 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,042,080 to Shepherd, et al (hereinafter, "Shepherd"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 is amended to clarify further aspects of the cable drop support system. More particularly, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the features formerly recited in dependent claim 9. Shepherd references a multi-purpose rest having a magnetic base, but does not disclose a control system as formerly recited in claim 9 and now recited in claim 1. Therefore, Shepherd does not support a § 102 rejection of claim 1 as now amended, and the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection. Claim 9 is cancelled

without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer, and claims 10 and 11 are amended to depend from claim 1.

The foregoing comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-8 and 18, which depend from claim 1 and stand rejected under § 102 on grounds similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections lodged against claims 2-8 and 18.

Independent claim 19 is amended to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, on at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Shepherd does not support a § 102 rejection of claim 19, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Brown Reference

As stated on Page 3 of the Action, claims 1-8, 9-13, and 18-20 are rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,709,172 to Brown (hereinafter, "Brown"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 is amended to clarify further aspects of the cable drop support system. More particularly, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the features formerly recited in dependent claim 14. Brown references a temporary surveillance system, but does not disclose a mechanical drive mechanism as formerly recited in claim 14 and now recited in claim 1. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Brown does not support a § 102 rejection of

claim 1, and the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this § 102 rejection lodged against claim 1.

The foregoing comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-13 and 18, which depend from claim 1 and stand rejected under § 102 on grounds similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these § 102 rejections lodged against claims 2-13 and 18.

Independent claims 19 and 20 are amended to recite features similar to that discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, on at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Brown does not support § 102 rejections of claims 19 and 20, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections lodged against claims 19 and 20.

Claim 20 is further revised to clarify still further features of the cable drop support system, as illustrated in the Applicant's Figure 6 and described in the written description at Paragraphs [0026] and [0027].

Sayovitz Reference

As stated on Page 4 of the Action, claims 1-5, 8-13, and 18 are rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,309,708 to Sayovitz (hereinafter, "Sayovitz"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 was amended above to clarify further aspects of the cable drop support system. More particularly, the features added to claim 1 to

address the Brown reference also address Sayovitz. Sayovitz references a vehicle mounting for a portable microwave antenna dish, but does not disclose a mechanical drive mechanism as formerly recited in claim 14 and now recited in claim 1. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Sayovitz does not support a § 102 rejection of claim 1, and the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

The foregoing comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-5, 8-13, and 18, which depend from claim 1 and stand rejected under § 102 on grounds similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these § 102 rejections lodged against claims 2-5, 8-13, and 18.

Rejections Based on § 103

As stated in Paragraph 3 of the Action, appearing on page 5 of the Action, claims 14-17 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,101,215 to Creaser (hereinafter, "Creaser"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding pending claims 14-17, the Applicant notes that these claims depend ultimately from claim 1. The three § 102 rejections lodged against claim 1, based on the Shepherd, Brown, and Sayovitz references, have been addressed above. However, in addition to the foregoing comments, the Applicant has revised claim 14 as indicated above to clarify further features of the cable drop

support system. The Applicant submits that these revisions are fully supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, by the Applicant's specification as originally filed, at least by Figure 6 and related discussion in Paragraph 26 of the Applicant's written description.

Creaser references a telescoping lightweight antenna tower assembly and the like. However, Creaser neither teaches nor suggests a "remote control device operative over the communication media to cause the mechanical drive mechanism to extend the cable receptacle relative to the base", as recited in claim 14. On at least this further basis, the Applicant submits that Brown and Creaser do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 14, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection lodged against claim 14.

Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14, so all comments directed to claim 14 above apply equally to claims 15-17. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejections lodged against claims 15-17.

Conclusion

The Applicant requests prompt and favorable action on this application at the earliest convenience of the Office. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Date: 18 AUG 05

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257